

IPR: ALERTS

March 3, 1999

ALERTS - briefed by Mark Philip, Project Officer (PO), and Wayne Easter, (OG), to COL Olear. Patsy Oburn, Functional Sponsor, absent on TDY.

Others present: COL Hill (Chief, Systems Engineering/Interoperability), Donna McKalip (Acquisition Team Chief), Donna Faulhaber (AB-Business Office), Tom Hartney (Analyst), Tory Baggiano (Analyst), , and Rod Barnaby (DSDC, Program Manager, via conference call.)

Minutes From IPR (Taskings in Blue):

Overview

- Mark summarized ALERTS objectives/benefits (detail in attached Quad Chart).
- Per Mark and approved by DCMC Commander, ALERTS will not be fielded to the four OCONUS sites due to lack of SDW cage codes.

Cost

- Per Mark, verified by Donna F., \$872k (96%) of the budgeted \$907k for FY99 has been obligated. The remaining \$35k is projected to be obligated to DSDC in Qtr 3.
- Per Mark, the current FY00 POM amount of \$386k (originally 1186K, minus 800K due to Phase 3 cancellation) was revised to \$600k, but needs an additional revision to \$1000k.
- Per Mark, the current FY01-06 POM of \$1508k needs to be revised to \$1791k.
- Per Donna F., the 800k for Phase 3 is currently in the FY00 POM.
- Donna F. requested that the ALERTS IPT verify/re-submit out-year POM \$ assumptions.
- Wayne questioned **when and if the \$800k was de-obligated, where the funding was re-distributed, and where the funding de-obligation documentation was located.**
- Per COL Olear, the Phase 3 funding was "verbally" de-obligated in an ITJSG Meeting in the Oct/Nov timeframe.
- Wayne questioned the basis for requiring funding obligation documentation and **NOT** requiring funding de-obligation documentation.
- Per Mark, Security Accreditation method is an issue as CI has recommended the PKI solution; however, applicable funding was not budgeted.
- Per COL Olear, **there is a need for a fully coordinated DLA Command Standard Security Accreditation Process.** In the meantime, DCMC will choose best Security alternative based on the functionality/funding trade-off.

ALERTS vs. SPS

- Per COL Olear, Wayne and Mark met with Dave Guinasso on 3/2/99 to discuss SPS vs. ALERTS functionality.
- Per Wayne, based on the meeting, it is not known which ALERTS functions that SPS v5.0 will have when it is fielded to DCMC (projected for FY02).
- Per COL Olear, **there is a current tasking to map SPS System Functionality to other DCMC Systems.** This must be performed in order properly manage the DCMC IT Plan for FY00-06 (reference SPS/MOCAS Retirement 2/4/99 IPR minutes to ITJSG).
- COL Olear stressed that the **Systems Mapping be performed/delivered to ITJSG ASAP.**
- Per Mark, ALERTS issue with SDW v8.5: ALERTS has mapped data to the MOCAS-SDW; under the new SPS concept, SPS maps data to a separate SPS- SDW. Therefore, there is no mechanism to get SPS-SDW data into ALERTS.
- When discussing adding an Alerts interface to the SPS-SDW, Mark was told the data required could only be obtained by interfacing to DPPS. This issue needs to be resolved as DIRAMS is also impacted.

- Per Donna M., the current challenge SPS presents is that originally, DCMC would design the IT Plan to fit into a defined SPS 5.0 functionality; however, the reality is that DCMC has had to adapt the IT Plan to an undefined SPS v5.0 moving target.
- Per COL Olear, **until DCMC knows SPS 5.0 functionality, the command must make an assumption on functionality, and then use that to make a consistent set of assumptions by the other initiatives sponsors.**
- COL Olear will talk to Marcia Case to request that the ITJSG Chairman formally **rank all DCMC IT Systems in terms of Funding Priority.**
- COL Olear will talk to Marcia Case to request that the Paperless Office Chief **define the set of DCMC IT Functionality Assumptions with which to base the DCMC IT Funding Plan.**

Schedule

- Per Mark, the **ALERTS schedule was impacted by delay of coding start, Version 2.2 test, and more realistic installation/training schedule (FOC slip May to August).**
- Per Mark, the new ALERTS deployment plan was submitted to ITLCMG on 3/1/99 for analysis.
- Per Mark, FAAST personnel will not be needed for CAO end-user training.
- Per COL Olear, the Robbins-Gioia analyst must determine the % variance from the current baseline in the ALERTS schedule to determine if an ITJSG review is needed.
- **SDW Version 8.5 is Critical to FOC as there will be a day for day slip beginning June 1, 1999 for ALERTS FOC based on each day delay from the current SDW 8.5 FOC.**
- **Oracle 8.0/Net 8.0 and training database stand-up are also critical to Alerts FOC.**
- Per Tom, given the current information in the ALERTS Deployment Plan, it is not possible to determine the whether the Plan is executable.
- Per Tom, after the accumulation of needed relevant data (i.e. number of training room slots/computers available, training strategy/ travel plan), the ITLCMG will be able to:
 - 1) Determine if the ALERTS Deployment Plan is executable.
 - 2) Provide support on Deployment Plan revisions/improvement.
 - 3) De-conflict the Deployment Plan with other DCMC IT System activity.
- COL Olear **tasked the ITLCMG to:**
 - 1) Analyze and recommend to the DCMC CIO on a **quarterly basis whether the IT Plan is currently certifiable to DCMC as executable.** Suspense: 3/31/99.
 - 2) Brief the ITJSG on **IT Plan Conflicts/Executability Issues** by 4/16/99.
 - 3) Provide the **listing of DCMC CAO training room locations/capacity** (required to de-conflict schedules) by 4/16/99.

Technical Status

- Per Mark, a successful Government Acceptance test was completed, 11 Jan - 26 Feb (see attached quad chart for detail)

Operational

- Per Mark, there may be an ALERTS requirement for **additional Infrastructure Funding** for Proliant 6000 servers.
- COL Olear tasked the ALERTS IPT to **coordinate with Major S.C. Ikirt to analyze the current infrastructure POM Funding assumptions/current requirements and, if needed, to adjust the Infrastructure POM to satisfy ALERTS infrastructure requirements by 3/31/99.**
- COL Olear tasked Donna M. to educate the AB Project Officers on their responsibility for Project Funding Package Planning for Software AND Infrastructure requirements by 4/24/99.
- Per Mark, TIVOLI Software deployment process needs improvement.

- Per COL Olear, **Dwayne Eriksen was tasked on 2/17/99** (reference EDW 2/17 IPR minutes to ITJSG) **to develop a DCMC Command Standard Tivoli Software Deployment Procedure to be delivered to COL Olear by 3/19/99.**
- Per Mark/Wayne, after careful analysis, it is not viable to perform a limited Operation Test with live data; ALERTS will be Operationally Tested upon Full Deployment.
- Per Mark, due to the drastic difference in data structures, there will be no data migration from Phase 1 to Phase 2. Use of Cognos and making Phase 1 "read only" are workarounds.
- Per Wayne, because there is a time lag between user training and FOC (a month or more at some CAOs), plans for follow-up ALERTS use training may be needed.
- COL Olear tasked the **Robbins-Gioia analyst to work with assigned persons on overdue taskings and get the taskings completed and approved by him.**